

stakeholder companies of Japan and Germany have been doing.

Companies that focus on making money become more competitive, and that in turn means more economic growth, and more jobs, and all the other results that "stakeholders" care about.

In both Japan and Germany, the false promise of lifetime employment is ending. They should have known better. A boss who can guarantee a job for life is like a doctor who promises that you'll never get sick or a preacher who promises you a place in heaven. It's too good to be true, so it isn't.

We don't have the keiretsu like the Japanese that help insulate managers. We don't have a large bank ownership of major corporations like both Japan and Germany that helps guarantee "patient" capital. All that would be illegal here. And we don't have co-determination and other social legislation like they do in Europe that sometimes gives employees as much say in major decisions as managers and owners.

Instead, we have owners who raise hell when they don't get the returns they expect. And companies have to listen. And companies change. And they provide those owners with their returns. And in the process, they usually get stronger.

Chrysler has added more than 15,000 hourly workers in the past five years. Those are not replacements, those are new jobs. We're in the process of building components in this country that we used to have to buy from Japan, because we've gotten more productive and it's cheaper to build here now.

Our goal was not to increase employment. Our goal was to get more competitive. New jobs and more security for the existing ones are simply results of being more competitive.

Chrysler is about to announce grants totaling \$5 million for the arts in Southeastern Michigan. But nowhere in our strategic planning did we say "take care of the arts." We're able to do it only because we focused on a different priority—financial success.

Chrysler, Ford and General Motors have been generous to this community for decades. We are major participants in the new Greater Downtown Partnership that is just being announced. But our real contribution has simply been staying in business. That's our role, and when we're successful, the whole community benefits.

Some people, like Senator Kennedy and Secretary Reich, wants to create the stakeholder economies of Germany and Japan here. They want to force companies to become a Big Brother. Washington has failed at it, so now let Corporate America do it. But they've discovered the allure of "stakeholder" politics at just the time it's losing its luster overseas.

The Japanese aren't building auto plants in Japan. They are closing them. They are building plants here, in America. So are the Germans—Mercedes in Alabama and BMW in South Carolina.

Has anybody else noticed that all the recent stories about ugly American corporations firing people left and right are butting up against other stories about the low unemployment rate in the country? Unemployment in Germany is almost 11 percent, and in this country it's 5.5 percent? I can pretty much guarantee you that saddling American companies with the same burdens that German companies have will get our unemployment numbers up too, if that's the idea.

America is the model for economic growth for most of the rest of the world. Some countries flirted with the Japanese model for a while, but now they've realized that it wasn't all it was cracked up to be.

Our securities markets are particularly important. There is nothing like them any-

where in the world. They are big. They are broad. They are unparalleled in their ability to raise capital.

But they are also messy. They punish inefficiency, sometime brutally. They can be capricious. They can be unfair. They can be perverse. It's almost expected these days that the markets rise on bad news and dive on good news. There is no human feeling to the markets, and sometimes no discernible evidence of human intelligence, either.

But they work. That's all they have going for them—over time, they work. And they work better than markets anywhere else.

The critics and the fear-mongers are missing an important point about those markets, by the way: They've become egalitarian. Through 401(k)s, IRAs, pension funds, and easy-to-access mutual funds, more than a third of all adult Americans are in the market.

The market used to be just for plutocrats. Today the ownership of American business is spread throughout the population.

The "new ownership" of Corporate America is rapidly becoming most of America.

That's healthy. It also helps to burst the bluster of the redistribution of wealth crowd. At least it would if more people understood that fact.

Corporate America has always had a PR problem. We haven't found a way to dress up certain economic realities so we can take them out in public. Making money is still considered tacky in some circles. Creating wealth for society doesn't carry much cache. Focusing on the bottom line is simply greed.

We haven't made the case that our end goal is not "making money," it's perpetuating ourselves so we can serve all our constituencies.

We can't even seem to cut through all the propaganda about American workers going backward. Real per capita income has risen steadily. So has median family income. Secretary Reich never uses those figures. He uses other measures which are less relevant.

And he never mentions the obvious fact that people do move up from one economic quintile to another. They don't all just stay put. They work hard, get better jobs, and make more money. Low income people become middle class, and middle class people become well-off. That's the American way, and it still happens.

There's no question, however, that some new dynamics are at work. The concentration of power within the large institutional investors is one. It's not necessarily good, and it's not necessarily bad. It's not something to resolve; it's just something else to manage.

Downsizing and layoffs are part of the price of becoming more competitive. The price for not doing it, however, is much higher in both economic and human terms.

The good part about globalization is that it allows American workers to participate more fully in the world economy. The bad part about globalization is that it forces American workers to participate more fully in the world economy.

The torrent of gloom today is mindless, however. The economy is strong. It's growing at a sustainable rate. Inflation is low and stable. Employment numbers are excellent. It looks like Mr. Greenspan is pulling off his soft landing. The stock market is going bananas.

American companies are leaner and meaner than they've been in years. American productivity is once again the envy of the world.

And American executives are not the ogres portrayed by the press in recent weeks. Big business has become an election-year straw man for those who like to pit American against American by promoting the politics of fear and envy.

There are some real problems to solve. We need to keep the economy strong, to improve our schools, to cut the budget deficit, to pay for health care, to keep Social Security solvent, and that's just the top of the list.

We need to stand together to do these things.

And he never mentions the obvious fact that people do move up from one economic quintile to another. They don't all just stay put. They work hard, get better jobs, and make more money. Low income people become middle class, and middle class people become well-off. That's the American way, and it still happens.

There's no question, however, that some new dynamics are at work. The concentration of power within the large institutional investors is one. It's not necessarily good, and it's not necessarily bad. It's not something to resolve; it's just something else to manage.

Downsizing and layoffs are part of the price of becoming more competitive. The price for not doing it, however, is much higher in both economic and human terms.

The good part about globalization is that it allows American workers to participate more fully in the world economy. The bad part about globalization is that it forces American workers to participate more fully in the world economy.

The torrent of gloom today is mindless, however. The economy is strong. It's growing at a sustainable rate. Inflation is low and stable. Employment numbers are excellent. It looks like Mr. Greenspan is pulling off his soft landing. The stock market is going bananas.

American companies are leaner and meaner than they've been in years. American productivity is once again the envy of the world.

And American executives are not the ogres portrayed by the press in recent weeks. Big business has become an election-year straw man for those who like to pit American against American by promoting the politics of fear and envy.

There are some real problems to solve. We need to keep the economy strong, to improve our schools, to cut the budget deficit, to pay for health care, to keep Social Security solvent, and that's just the top of the list.

We need to stand together to do these things. We need to have some confidence that we, as a nation, are all moving in the same direction.

But it's a sure thing that we'll never accomplish any of these if we let a bunch of demagogues herd us down the past to class warfare.

#### THE AMERICA WE SEEK

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, there is no more troubling issue confronting Americans than that of abortion. The highly respected publication, *National Review*, March 25, 1996, has performed a signal service by publishing a very thoughtful article on this question signed by 45 of America's finest scholars, all of whom have thought long and hard about this volatile subject. I commend this article to my colleagues' careful attention.

THE AMERICA WE SEEK; A STATEMENT OF PRO-LIFE PRINCIPLE AND CONCERN

Americans are conducting the sixth presidential election campaign since the Supreme

Court decreed a virtually unlimited "right" to abortion in *Roe v. Wade* and its companion case, *Doe v. Bolton*. Over the past 23 years, the abortion debate has been about abortion, of course; but it has also been a debate about the kind of society America is and seeks to be. Throughout our national history, few issues have so sharply focused attention on the fundamental purposes of the American democratic experiment. For, in the abortion debate, we are required to confront an urgent moral issue: Who is to be included in the community of the commonly protected?

The following statement of principle, endorsed by a broad spectrum of pro-life organizational leaders and scholars, is the result of consultations held over the past several months at the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington, D.C. The statement aims to clarify the principles on which the pro-life movement stands, to articulate a pro-life vision of the American future, and to suggest a set of political, legal, and cultural strategies that are capable of translating that vision into reality. The signatories, who join the statement as individuals, offer this statement to the public in the hope that it will raise the level of public discourse on this highly controversial issue, and thus strengthen American democracy. The signatories are deeply grateful to NATIONAL REVIEW for opening its pages to their ideas and concerns.

Twenty-three years after the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* decisions, the conscience of the American people remains deeply troubled by the practice of abortion on demand. Because of these two decisions, abortion is legal at any time in pregnancy, for virtually any reason, in every state. This constitutes an almost completely unrestricted private license to judge who will live and who will die.

That America has the most permissive abortion regime among the world's democracies is a betrayal of the American promise of justice for all. That is why a new sense of moral concern is stirring throughout our country in this election year. That is why millions of Americans have refused to accept the Court's 1992 admonition in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* to stop debating the issue.

2. To those weary of this argument, it may seem that there is nothing more to be said on this matter of abortion. We disagree.

Survey research tells us that the American people do not want a legal regime of abortion on demand for any reason, at any time during a pregnancy. We believe we have an obligation to employ the arts of democratic persuasion to help reinstitute legal protection for all unborn children.

The extent of the abortion license and its reach into other areas of law and public policy is widely underestimated. We believe that, as citizens of the United States, we have the responsibility to discuss with our fellow citizens the facts of the abortion license and its impact on our common life.

Many women in crisis earnestly seek alternatives to abortion. We believe we ought to encourage those alternatives and help to provide them.

3. Pro-life service to women in crisis and pro-life advocacy on behalf of legal reform are expressions of our highest ideals as citizens of the United States. We affirm the nobility of the American democratic experiment in ordered liberty. We affirm the rule of law and the principle of equal protection under the law, even as we work to reform constitutional and statutory law so that the American legal system is, once again, congruent with the Founders' claim that the inalienable right to life is one of the great moral truths on which American democracy rests. We want an America that is open, hos-

pitabile, and caring—a community of civic friendship in which neighbors reach out to assist neighbors in distress.

4. The abortion license has helped to erode the moral foundations of the American civic community. Right now we are not the country we ought to be. That distress is, to us, a sign of moral vitality. We speak now because we seek to defend the America we love. We speak to promote the cause of an America in which women and men, together, rebuilding the fabric of civil society by acknowledging our common responsibility to serve and protect the weakest and most vulnerable among us. We speak for a rebirth of freedom in these United States: a freedom that finds its fulfillment in goodness.

#### VICTIMS OF THE LICENSE

5. Americans of every race, economic condition, religion, and political persuasion share a common concern today for what some have called a national "virtue deficit." As a country, we have not paid sufficient attention to nurturing those habits of heart and mind that make democratic self-government possible and that undergird what the Framers of the Constitution called "civic virtue." We believe that the abortion license is a critical factor in America's virtue deficit.

6. Abortion kills 1.5 million innocent human beings in America every year. There is no longer any serious scientific dispute that the unborn child is a human creature who dies violently in the act of abortion. This brute fact is the root of our national distress over the abortion license. Abortion kills; few would now deny that. But in order to defend the private "right" to lethal violence that is the essence of abortion, proponents of the license frequently resort to euphemisms like "products of conception" and "the termination of pregnancy."

The public dialogue is not coarsened by depictions of the reality of abortion. But a coarsening of our common life has taken place; it is evident in the lack of moral revulsion that follows one newspaper's accurate description of an abortion procedure that "breaks . . . apart" the "fetus" before "it" is "suctioned out of the uterus" or "extracted."

7. The abortion license hurts women. Some (including the narrow Supreme Court majority in the 1992 *Casey* decision) contend that the license is necessary to ensure social and economic gains for women. It is ever more clear, though, that women pay a huge price for abortion. By providing an alleged technological "fix" for unintended pregnancy, the license has encouraged widespread male irresponsibility and predatory male sexual behavior. Abortion-on-demand has given an excuse to a man who shirks his responsibilities, claiming that the child he helped conceive ought to have been aborted, or that the woman who declined to abort may not impose on him any responsibility for her "lifestyle choice."

Fathers have also been harmed and dehumanized by the abortion license. Some watch their children killed against their will; others learn to their distress only much later that a child they would have raised is dead. Even when agreeing to support the abortion decision, fathers, like mothers, suppress their grief deny their protective instincts, and otherwise damage themselves when they allow the killing of their own children. Abortion contributes to the marginalization of fatherhood in America, which many agree is a primary cause of the alarming breakdown of American family life.

The license has thus poisoned relationships between women and men, even as it has done serious harm to the thousands of women who now suffer from the effects of post-abortion

grief. The women of America do not need abortion to be full participants in our society. To suggest otherwise is to demean women, to further distort relationships between women and men, and to aggravate the difficulties of re-creating in America a community of virtue and mutual responsibility.

#### THE PUBLIC DIMENSION

8. Abortion is not simply a matter of private "choice." Rather, the abortion license cuts to the heart of America's claim to being a law-governed democracy, in which equality before the law is a fundamental principle of justice. The abortion license also threatens the cultural foundations of our democratic political community. For if it becomes a settled matter in American law and in American public morality that there is, in fact, a private "right" to use lethal violence to "solve" personal, family, or social problems, then the claim of American democracy to be an expression of the people's commitment to "establish justice" will be undermined, just as it was when the law claimed the "right" to exclude certain Americans from its full protection on the basis of race. Thus the abortion issue is the crucial civil-rights issue of our time.

9. A sweeping abortion license was defined unilaterally by the Supreme Court without recourse to the normal procedures of democratic debate and legislation. This in itself wounded American democracy. And the Court's persistent refusal to permit the American people to debate the basic issue of an alleged "right to abortion" in their legislatures continues to damage our democracy by alienating tens of millions of Americans from their institutions of government.

10. The Court's definition of a "right to abortion"—first enunciated as a "privacy right," then as a "liberty right" under the Fourteenth Amendment—has had other damaging effects. The language of "rights" puts the dilemma of unwanted pregnancy into a legal-adversarial context, pitting mother against child, and even father against mother. But as the common experience of humanity—and, increasingly, the findings of science—demonstrates, what hurts one party in this most intimate of human relationships hurts both parties. The America we seek is an America in which both mother and child are the subjects of our concern and our community's protection. To abuse the language of "rights" in this matter further advances the demeaning practice of reducing all human relationships in America to matters of adversarial adjudication. This is a prescription for democratic decay. For democracy rests on the foundations of civil society, and in a truly civil society, relationships between people have a far richer moral texture than that suggested by adversarial procedure.

11. The Court's vain attempt to justify the abortion license in terms of an all-encompassing right of personal autonomy has begun to infect other areas of the law. Thus the "autonomy" logic of the Court's 1992 *Casey* decision is now invoked as a warrant for a constitutional "right" to euthanasia. And if it were followed to its conclusion, this logic would require us to consider such profound human relationships as the bond between husband and wife, or the bond between parents and children, to be nothing more than matters of contract, with the claims of the autonomous individual trumping all other claims. Enshrined by the Court to legalize abortion on demand, this autonomy logic threatens to give us an America in which the only actors of consequence are the individual and the state; no other community, including the community of husband and wife, or the community of parents and children, will have effective constitutional standing.

12. The Supreme Court's insistence on a "right" to abortion has had other disturbing effects on our public life. This "right" has been used to justify the abridgment of First Amendment freespree rights, as when sidewalk counselors are threatened with legal penalties for proposing protection and care to women in crisis at the crucial moment of decision outside an abortion clinic. This "right" has been used by the Federal Government to coerce state governments into providing abortions, even when state legislatures or popular referenda have clearly registered the people's unwillingness to use public funds for elective abortions. The abortion "right" has distorted our national health-care debate, as well as the debate over welfare reform. It has even had an impact on U.S. foreign policy. American attempts to impose the "right" on the rest of the world at the 1994 Cairo world conference on population and the 1995 Beijing world conference on women have been deeply resented by other countries, as have U.S. attempts to promote abortion overseas through foreign aid.

13. The Court's attempt to define a "right" to abortion has polarized institutions and professions that were once among the bulwarks of American civil society. Professional associations of lawyers, academics, teachers, and civil servants have been divided by attempts to enlist their resources and prestige in support of abortion on demand, and in opposition to any effort to regulate abortion even in ways held constitutional by the Supreme Court. The medical profession has been deeply divided over its relationship to the abortion license. That the practice of abortion on demand is now widely recognized within the medical community as contradictory to the most deeply held values of the profession of healing is, we believe, a sign of hope. Yet some medical groups now threaten to reverse this trend by coercion—for example, by requiring medical residency programs to teach and perform abortion techniques. There are also disturbing signs of the corrupting influence of the abortion license in other professions. History has been rewritten to provide specious justification for *Roe v. Wade*. The teaching of law has been similarly distorted, as have political theory and political science. Such extremism underlines the unavoidable public character of the abortion license. The abortion license has a perverse Midas quality—it corrupts whatever it touches.

#### THE WAY AHEAD

14. Our goal is simply stated: we seek an America in which every unborn child is protected in law and welcomed in life. Legal reform and cultural renewal must both take place if America is to experience a new birth of the freedom that is ordered to goodness. We have just described, in this statement, the nature, sources, and dimension of our concern. Now, as pro-life leaders and scholars, we want to propose a program of action which we believe will appeal to Americans with open minds and hearts on this issue.

15. Means are always available to enable women to overcome the burdens that can accompany pregnancy and child-rearing. There are always alternatives to abortion. To legacy of *Roe v. Wade* involves a massive denial of this truth and deformation of social attitudes and practices so pervasive that women are actually encouraged to have abortions as the "easier" road to the goals that an unexpected pregnancy appears to threaten. As individuals and as a society, we bear a common responsibility to make sure that all women know that their own physical and spiritual resources, joined to those of a society that truly affirms and welcomes life, are sufficient to overcome whatever obstacles preg-

nancy and child-rearing may appear to present. Women instinctively know, and we should never deny, that this path will involve sacrifice. But this sacrifice must no longer remain a one-way street. In particular men must also assume their proper share of the responsibilities that family life—indeed, civilization itself—requires.

16. The pro-life movement must redouble its efforts to provide alternatives to abortion for women in crisis. There are now over 3,000 pregnancy-care centers in the United States, providing medical, educational, financial, and spiritual assistance to women who, facing the dilemma of a crisis pregnancy, bravely choose to carry their unborn children to term. We support an expansion of this service to our neighbors, so that by the turn of the century what we believe to be true today has become unmistakably clear to every American woman: No one in the United States has to have an abortion.

17. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe that adoption is preferable to abortion. We must streamline and simplify the legal procedures involved in adoption, while providing effective support to those married couples who choose to adopt.

18. The abortion license is inextricably bound up with the mores of the sexual revolution. Promotion of the pro-life cause also requires us to support and work with those who are seeking to re-establish the moral linkage between sexual expression and marriage, and between marriage and procreation. We believe that a renewal of American democracy as a virtuous society requires us to honor and promote an ethic of self-command and mutual responsibility, and to resist the siren song of the false ethic of unbridled self-expression.

19. Service to women in crisis, the promotion of adoption, and the restoration of sound sexual morality are essential if we are to experience a national cultural renewal that will help to sustain legal reform of the abortion license. The way in which we pursue the latter is also crucial, both to cultural renewal and legal reform.

We pledge ourselves to exercise the arts of democratic persuasion in advancing our legal agenda. We urge Congress and the courts to reconsider their ill-advised restriction on the rights of pro-life activists.

We unequivocally reject the use of violence in the pro-life cause as contrary to the central moral principles of our movement. For more than 23 years, we have worked within the democratic process to advance the protection of all innocent human life, and we will continue to do so.

20. The unborn child in America today enjoys less legal protection than an endangered species of bird in a national forest. In this situation, we believe a broad-based legal and political strategy is essential. There are many steps to be taken on the road to an America in which every unborn child is protected in law and welcomed in life. Thus we find no contradiction between a rigorous adherence to our ultimate goal and the pursuit of reforms that advance us toward that goal. Legal reforms that fall short of our goal, but that help move us toward it, save lives and aid in the process of moral and cultural renewal.

21. In its 1992 *Casey* decision, the Supreme Court agreed that the State of Pennsylvania could regulate the abortion industry in a number of ways. These regulations do not afford any direct legal protection to the unborn child. Yet experience has shown that such regulations—genuine informed consent, waiting periods, parental notification—reduce abortions in a locality, especially when coupled with positive efforts to promote alternatives to abortion and service to women in crisis. A national effort to enact

Pennsylvania-type regulations in all fifty states would be a modest but important step toward the America we seek.

22. Congress also has the opportunity to contribute to legal reform of the abortion license. A number of proposals are now being debated in the Congress, including bans on certain methods of abortion and restrictions on federal funding of abortions. We believe that Congress should adopt these measures and that the President should sign them into law. Any criminal sanctions considered in such legislation should fall upon abortionists, not upon women in crisis. We further urge the discussion of means by which Congress could recognize the unborn child as a human person entitled to the protection of the Constitution.

23. The right to life of the unborn will not be secured until it is secure under the Constitution of the United States. As it did in *Brown v. Board of Education* (when it rejected the *Plessy v. Ferguson* doctrine of "separate but equal" as an adequate expression of rights secured under the Fourteenth Amendment), the Supreme Court could reject the "central finding" of *Roe v. Wade*, that abortion on demand is required by an unenumerated "right to privacy" protected in part by the Fourteenth Amendment. The claim that such a correction of error would damage the Court's authority is belied by the experience of *Brown v. Board of Education*, and by the fact that the Court has corrected its own erroneous interpretations of the Constitution on scores of other occasions.

A more enduring means of constitutional reform is a constitutional amendment both reversing the doctrines of *Roe v. Wade* and *Casey*, and establishing that the right to life protected by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments extends to the unborn child. Such an amendment would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the states: a requirement that underlines the importance of establishing a track record of progressive legal change on behalf of the unborn child at the state and local levels.

Even with a constitutional amendment, every path to the protection and welcome we seek for unborn children requires the re-empowerment of the people of the United States and their elected representatives to debate and resolve the specific statutory enactments that will govern the question of abortion. A constitutional amendment, in other words, is not a self-executing instrument that will end the debate on abortion. It will, rather, correct a gross misinterpretation of the Constitution (as was required to reverse the grievous errors of the *Dred Scott* decision) and require states to debate and adopt policies that do not violate the unborn child's right to life.

Such a process does not, we emphasize, amount to the determination of moral truth by majority rule. Rather, it requires conforming fundamental constitutional principle to a fundamental moral truth—that abortion is the unwarranted taking of an innocent human life. Such a process also respects the role of representative government in fashioning policies that will ultimately secure that principle in practice. The project of constitutional reform on this issue, as on the precedent issues of slavery and segregation, is to bring our legal system into congruence with basic moral truths about the human person.

#### AN APPEAL TO OUR NEIGHBORS

24. We believe the pro-life cause is an expression of the premise and promise of American democracy. The premise is that we are all created equal; the promise is that there is justice for all. For all the reasons cited above, the abortion license has done grave

damage to America: it has killed tens of millions of unborn children, caused untold anguish to their mothers, and marginalized fathers in our society. The renewal of American democracy according to the highest ideals of the Founders requires us to stand for the inalienable right to life of the unborn, to stand with women in crisis, and to stand against the abortion license.

25. Few Americans celebrate the abortion license today. For many who are troubled by the license and its impact on our society, to be "reluctantly pro-choice" is now thought to be the responsible position. We respectfully urge those of our neighbors who hold that position to reconsider. We ask them to ponder the relationship between the abortion license and the crisis of family life in America. We ask them to reconsider whether radical autonomy is a sufficient understanding of freedom. We ask them to reflect, again, on the morality of abortion itself. We ask them to think about the social impact of a legally defined private "right" to lethal violence.

We ask them to ask themselves: "Is American society, today, more hospitable, caring, and responsible than it was before *Roe v. Wade*?" We believe the answer is "No." Problems that the proponents of abortion claimed the license would help alleviate—such as childhood poverty, illegitimacy, and child abuse—have in fact gotten worse, throughout every level of our society, since *Roe v. Wade*. Thus we respectfully ask our neighbors to consider the possibility of a connection—cultural as well as legal—between the virtue deficit in contemporary American life and the abortion license.

26. The pro-life movement is about affirmation. Thus we ask our neighbors, of whatever political persuasion or current conviction on the matter of abortion, to engage in a great national debate about the America we seek, and the relationship of the abortion license to that future. We ask all Americans to join with us in providing effective, compassionate service to women in crisis. Work on alternatives to abortion and on the reform of adoption laws and procedures can create the conditions for a new dialogue on the future of abortion law and practice in America. We are ready for that new conversation. We invite all our neighbors to join us.

Mary Cunningham Agee, The Nurturing Network; Don Argue, National Association of Evangelicals; Hadley Arkes, Amherst College; Gary Bauer, Family Research Council; Robert P. Casey, Fund for the American Family, Campaign for the American Family; Samuel B. Casey, The Center for Law and Religious Freedom, Christian Legal Society; Charles W. Colson, Prison Fellowship; Guy M. Condon, Care Net; Marjorie Dannenfelser, Susan B. Anthony List; Midge Decter, Author; John J. DiIulio, Jr., Princeton University; Bernard Dobranski, The Catholic University of America, School of Law; James C. Dobson, Focus on the Family; Jean Bethke Elshtain, University of Chicago; Clarke D. Forsythe, Americans United for Life; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Emory University; Wanda Franz, National Right to Life Committee; Edward McGlynn Gaffney, Valparaiso University, School of Law; Robert P. George, Princeton University; Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard University; David P. Gushee, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; Russell Hittinger, Catholic University of America; Kay C. James, Robertson School of Government, Regent University;

Phillip E. Johnson, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law; William Kristol, Project for the Republican Future; Beverly LaHaye, Concerned Women for America; Richard Land, Christian Life Commission; Southern Baptist Convention; Glenn C. Loury, Boston University; Frederica Mathewes-Green, National Women's Coalition for Life; Michael W. McConnell, University of Chicago, School of Law; Gilbert Meilaender, Oberlin College; Bernard N. Nathanson, MD, Center of Clinical and Research Ethics, Vanderbilt University; Richard John Neuhaus, Institute on Religion and Public Life; David Novak, University of Virginia; Michael Novak, American Enterprise Institute; Marvin Olasky, University of Texas at Austin; Frank A. Pavone, Priests for Life; Ralph Reed, Christian Coalition; Victor G. Rosenblum, Northwestern University; Ronald J. Sider, Evangelicals for Social Action; David M. Smolin, Cumberland Law School, Samford University; David Stevens, MD, Christian Medical and Dental Society; Jim Wallis, Sojourners; George Weigel, Ethics and Public Policy Center; and Jack C. Willke, MD, Life Issues Institute.

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 20, 1996*

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day, which falls on March 25, 1996. I have had the opportunity to visit Greece on several occasions, and I treasure the time I was able to spend in this great nation. Not only has Greece been a loyal ally and NATO member, but Greek-Americans have also made great efforts to enrich the United States. In celebrating Greek independence, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect upon efforts that have been made in the 104th Congress.

We have spoken out for and voted for the Porter amendment which cut aid to Turkey from \$42 million to \$21 million. This gesture shows that the United States will no longer tolerate countries who block U.S. humanitarian assistance and who consistently violate human rights standards.

I am also pleased that Congress has finally made an effort to end the Cypriot struggle for freedom from Turkish dominance. As one of the original cosponsors of the Cyprus Demilitarization Act, I am proud that the United States has finally called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus. This measure shows that we are committed to resolving this 20-year-old dispute based on the relevant U.N. resolutions.

When I learned about the approved sale of U.S. Army Tactical Missile Systems to Turkey, there was a need to organize and fight this transaction. I am proud of the initiative I took by introducing H. Con. Res. 124 which ex-

presses Congress' disapproval of the proposed sale due to Turkey's human rights record. I have asked the Speaker to attach this bill to the final budget proposal.

The Greek-American community has a lot to celebrate on March 25—these efforts have been monumental. The newly formed Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, of which I am a founding member, will help us continue our efforts on these issues. I am proud to have been an instrumental part of this progress. I look forward to continued bipartisan support.

I would like to express my sincere congratulations to Greek-Americans and the people of Greece on this day of independence.

#### BLANCA SANDOVAL, A DEVOTED MOTHER AND EXEMPLARY INDIVIDUAL

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 22, 1996*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very distinguished and outstanding individual from my district. Blanca Sandoval has been a devoted mother and someone who has inspired many of her fellow community members. In recognition of her gracious work and outstanding accomplishments, Mrs. Sandoval will have her 90th birthday celebration at Las Palmas Restaurant in west New York.

Mrs. Sandoval was born on March 20, 1906, in Trinidad, Cuba. She grew up in the province of Las Villas and was living in Havana before arriving in this country. She married a decorated naval lieutenant, Laudelino Gronnig, and had three children. Asnaldo, Miriana, and Blancy were raised during a difficult period in Cuban history. The family constantly dealt with the harassment and intimidation of a brutal dictatorship.

In search of liberty and freedom, Mrs. Sandoval and her husband sought to emigrate from the island of Cuba so they could be reunited with their children. Unfortunately, Mr. Gronnig never got to see his children in the United States because he was repeatedly denied departure. He died in Cuba before he could be reunited.

Miriana and Blancy arrived in the United States in 1971, and their brother subsequently joined them. It was 11 years later that Mrs. Sandoval was reunited with her family. She quickly learned to love her adopted homeland and is now looking forward to becoming a citizen. She is well respected by her friends and neighbors and is known to them as Mima.

Blanca Sandoval is adored by her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. I am proud to have such a loving and caring individual residing in my district.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 21, 1996*

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor